

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 are currently pending.
- Claims 1-4, 6-16, 21, 25, 26, and 28 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments to the claims is found at least in Figure 3 and in the parts of the specification describing Figure 3. None of the amendments herein introduce new matter.

### **Claims 1-4, 6-16, 25, 26, and 28 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-4, 6-16, 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

### **Claims 13-16 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly failing to distinctly claim and particularly point out the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

## Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Alexander:** Ronald Alexander, U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931
- **Park:** Chul-Jun Park et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032528

## Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 Are Non-Obvious Over Alexander in view of Park

Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Alexander in view of Park. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

### Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited documents do not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 1. Specifically, the cited documents do not teach or suggest at least the claimed (with a deleted choice from an alternative phrase shown with a strike-through):

...in response to one or more triggering user interactions, presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming, the EPG-navigation UI having one or more user-selectable options therein,

wherein the triggering user interactions include

~~a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or~~

a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future...

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites paragraphs 29, 31, and 32 of Park as describing, "in response to one or more triggering user interactions, presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI." That passage describes alternating between EPG modes, which include a full EPG mode, a mini EPG mode, and a quick EPG mode, by pressing a scroll key, such as a down arrow or up arrow. Each press changes the mode.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the nature of the triggering user interactions. As recited in amended claim 1, the triggering interactions include "a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future."

In contrast, the key presses in Park do not advance presentation of scheduled programming, much less advance it a predefined amount of time. Rather, as mentioned, the presses simply change EPG modes and do nothing else. While Alexander discusses pressing a key to scroll forward in time within a program guide, this scrolling forward only advances programming and does not trigger presentation of a quick EPG-navigation UI. Thus, the combined cited documents do not teach a single key that, when pressed, both advances presentation of scheduled programming and triggers the presentation of a quick EPG-navigation UI.

Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 13 and 17

Claims 13 and 17 are also patentable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Independent Claim 21

In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 21 is moot. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the claimed (with emphasis added):

...present, simultaneously with the schedule of multimedia programming, an inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI in response to one or more triggering user interactions received by the input unit, the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI being inlaid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming and having two display areas each including user-selectable options therein, ***the two display areas including a first display area having user-selectable options for finding shows by name or keyword and a second area having user-selectable options for finding shows by time, the two display areas being separate and distinct and the user-selectable options of the two display areas being different from one another...***

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner points to col. 9, lines 65-66, col. 10, lines 36-49, and figures 8 and 9 of Alexander (Office Action, page 3). These passages and figures describe a "Grid Guide" shown in an all channel format that displays channels vertically and time slots horizontally, enabling a user to time browse programming by pressing left and right arrow keys and to channel browse programming by pressing up and down arrow keys. The Examiner equates the displayed channels to the first display

area and the displayed times to the second display area.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 21 to clarify the nature of the first and second display areas. Claim 21 now states that these areas are separate and distinct and that their user-selectable options are different from one another. In contrast, the channel and time displays in the Grid Guide of Alexander are not separate and distinct. Rather, each entry in the Grid Guide includes both a channel and a time, thereby combining the channel and time displays into a single display area referred to as the Grid Guide in Alexander. And even ignoring this difference, the time and channel displays of Alexander do not include "user-selectable options [that are] different from one another." Instead, an option associated with a time display (i.e., a time column) is always also associated with a channel display (i.e., a channel row). Thus, the displays in Alexander *share* selectable options. Thus, such options are not different from one another, as is claimed in amended claim 21.

Applicant has also examined Park and can find no teaching or suggestion of "the two display areas including a first display area having user-selectable options for finding shows by name or keyword and a second area having user-selectable options for finding shows by time, the two display areas being separate and distinct and the user-selectable options of the two display areas being different from one another." Rather, Park simply mentions three EPG modes and does not appear to go into detail about any display areas those EPGs might have.

Also, Applicant notes that the new recitations of claim 21 have not been presented in any previous version of the claims and have not been rejected by the

Examiner. Thus, the addition of these recitations is alone sufficient to overcome the rejection of claim 21.

Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

**Independent Claim 25**

Claim 25 is also patentable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 21.

**Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28**

Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25. As discussed above, claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25 are patentable over the cited documents of record. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

For example, claims 7, 16, 18, 24 and 28 were previously amended to recite that "the user-selectable options include: an option to search future programming based upon one or more characteristics of that programming; an option to look ahead into the schedule of multimedia programming of the EPG UI; an option to view one or more live television multimedia programs; an option to view one or more on-demand multimedia programs; an option to view one or more pay-per-view multimedia programs; an option

to view one or more locally stored multimedia programs; an option to view one or more pay-per-view multimedia programs; an option to view one or more multimedia commercial messages; and an option to filter or otherwise adjust the parameters the determine which programs are listed by time within the grid.” In rejecting previous versions of these claims, the Examiner cited col. 11, lines 35-36 of Alexander which, according to the Examiner, teach that “the viewer is also given the option of filtering.” Even if the Examiner is correct in characterizing the cited portion of Alexander, claims 7, 16, 19, 24, and 28 now require more than simply an option for filtering. Applicant notes that this same argument was made in the last response. In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner maintained the previous rejections and did not address this argument. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner address this argument.

Also, claims 10 and 20 recite: “receiving a scroll forward input after the presenting of the EPG-navigation UI and, in response, presenting the EPG without the EPG-navigation UI.” In rejecting claims 10 and 20, the Examiner cites col. 10, lines 37-42 of Alexander. This passage describes scrolling within an EPG. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that scrolling within an EPG does not teach or suggest presenting an EPG without an EPG-navigation UI in response to a scroll forward input received after the presentation of the EPG-navigation UI. No reference is even made to an EPG-navigation UI, much less to receiving a scroll forward input after presenting such a UI.

Additionally, claim 11 recites that “***the quick EPG-navigation UI is presented so that*** it is inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern and so that ***it is shown as being associated with a channel***”

(emphasis added). In rejecting claim 11, the Examiner points to Figure 7 of Alexander which, according to the Examiner, shows a “quick navigation table.” In response, Applicant notes that even if Figure 7 does show a “quick navigation table,” that table is not shown as being “inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern”, as required by claim 11. Also, claim 11 requires that the EPG-navigation UI be “shown as being associated with a channel.” Neither Figure 7 of Alexander nor any other portion of any of the cited references shows such an EPG-navigation UI. Applicant notes that this same argument was made in the last response. In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner maintained the previous rejections and did not address this argument. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner address this argument.

## **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck, Req. No. 56826/

Dated: 11/05/2010

Robert C. Peck  
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826

Kayla D. Brant  
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)  
Registration No. 46576